*Attachment No. 3 to Order No. 434/2020*

Faculty Report

of the Faculty Committee for Education Quality Assurance

Faculty: ..................................

Academic year: ..................................

1. Report on the repair programme implementation adopted in the previous academic year. \*)
2. Assessment of methods of verification of learning outcomes.
3. Analysis of the results of student’s questionnaires, reports on class inspection and graduate student’s questionnaires, excluding their professional careers.
4. Opinion of external stakeholders, including units where student internships are served (opinion of an internship supervisor), on preparing future graduates for professional work and the legitimacy and correctness of developing new study programmes.
5. Assessment of the procedure for awarding a degree.
6. Assessment of PhD studies in cooperation with their heads.
7. Assessment of postgraduate studies in cooperation with their heads.
8. Giving opinions on study programmes for the cycle of education commencing the next academic year.
9. The scope of repair actions and their schedule, including individual fields of study and the entire faculty.
10. Summary and final conclusions.

……………………………………………

Date and signature of the Chairman

of the Faculty Committee for Education Quality Assurance

*\*) - the number of characters in individual points should not exceed 2,000*

**ATTACHMENTS**

**Annotation 6**

Results of graduate student’s questionnaires

Results of questionnaires concerning classes and teachers conducting classes in PhD studies

Academic year: ..................................

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Faculty: .................................. | % of positive opinions | % of negative opinions |
| Survey questions, Attachment No. 2 |
| Assessment of the method of conducting classes | | |
| Didthe classes help you broaden general knowledge allowing you to better understand your discipline? |  |  |
| Did the classes allow you to develop practical skills in the field of editing scientific papers, presenting reports (it mainly applies to seminars)? |  |  |
| Were the conditions of conducting classes favourable (date, room equipment)? |  |  |
| Were the criteria for getting credits clear, generally available and respected by the teacher? |  |  |
| Assessment of a given university teacher | | |
| Did the teacher present the course content in a communicative and understandable way? |  |  |
| Did the teacher offer individual assistance in the form of consultations? |  |  |
| Did the teacher enable active participation in the classes (initiated discussions, allowed student to express their own opinion)? |  |  |
| Did the teacher have the right attitude towards students (punctuality, reliability, propriety)? |  |  |

The grading scale used to compile questionnaires from Attachment No. 2:

positive: from 5 to 3

negative: from 2 to 1

Results of PhD graduates’ questionnaires

Faculty: ………………………………………

Academic year: ………………………………………

Number of PhD graduates / number of respondents: ………………. / ……………….

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Questions | Grading scale used to compile questionnaires | | |
|  | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 1. Availability of information on the University and faculty websites on PhD studies (is it accessible and comprehensive)? |  |  |  |
| 1. Transparency of PhD enrolment requirements. |  |  |  |
| 1. Clarity of rules of PhD studies presented at the beginning of studies (as regards getting credits, taking exams, registering and conferring procedure for a doctoral degree etc.). |  |  |  |
| 1. Possibility of PhD student co-participating as an observer in classes that he/she will later conduct with students as a teacher. |  |  |  |
| 1. Assistance provided by more experienced university teachers in preparing for classes? |  |  |  |
| 1. Permanent access to a computer and having one’s own workstation. |  |  |  |
| 1. Number (offer) of optional subjects. |  |  |  |
| 1. Doctoral curriculum. |  |  |  |
| 1. Support received from an organizational unit or the University during PhD studies, such as: |  | | |
| * financial support for research work, |  |  |  |
| * assistance in obtaining grant/scholarship for research, |  |  |  |
| * creating opportunities to publish papers, |  |  |  |
| * availability of literature needed to write a PhD dissertation in the university library. |  |  |  |
| 1. Decision to take up doctoral studies. |  |  |  |
| 1. Quality of administrative service provided to students in the dean’s office. |  |  |  |
| 1. The supervisor’s commitment. |  |  |  |

**Annotation 7**

Results of postgraduate students’ questionnaires

Name of studies: ………………………………………

Number of postgraduate students/Number of respondents: ………………. / ……………….

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | % positive opinions | % of negative opinions | no opinion |
| 1. Satisfaction with the study programme. |  |  |  |
| 1. Level of classes. |  |  |  |
| 1. Topicality of the content covered by the study programme |  |  |  |
| 1. Were the students able to propose changes to the study programme? |  |  |  |
| 1. Usefulness of teaching materials received during studies. |  |  |  |
| 1. Teaching methods. |  |  |  |
| 1. Means of communication between the head of postgraduate studies and students. |  |  |  |
| 1. The extent to which postgraduate studies met expectations. |  |  |  |
| 1. Raising professional qualifications. |  |  |  |
| 1. Usefulness of postgraduate studies in professional development. |  |  |  |
| 1. Preferred lecturers (% of responses): |  | | |
| 1. university teachers, |  | | |
| 1. outstanding researchers, |  | | |
| 1. university teachers and research workers alike, |  | | |
| 1. others. |  | | |